

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 4647.  
U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL RE-  
LATIONS,

*Washington, DC, September 28, 1998.*

Hon. ROBERT F. SMITH,  
*Chairman, Committee on Agriculture,*  
*Washington, DC.*

DEAR CHAIRMAN SMITH: I understand that the Committee on Agriculture is requesting that the House leadership permit the consideration of H.R. 4647 on the suspension calendar. This bill is identical to H.R. 3654 as introduced, with the exception of a technical change.

My understanding is that because of our Committee's jurisdiction over exports and national security issues under Rule X of the Rules of the House of Representatives, our Committee would be entitled to a sequential referral of this bill were it reported in the form introduced.

As I have discussed with Mr. Ewing, the sponsor of the bill, because of the need for prompt disposition of this matter, we have no objection to the consideration of this bill as introduced as a suspension item.

While not objecting to the consideration of the bill on the suspension calendar, however, I would like to state that we do not waive our jurisdiction over this bill or its subject matter. I would request that, in light of our support for early action on the bill on the suspension calendar, (a) you undertake to support the naming of members of the Committee on International Relations as conferees on this bill, should a conference occur, and (b) you consult with me on any further action on the bill or on any counterpart from the Senate.

I also request that you include this correspondence and your response to it in the Record when the bill is considered.

With best wishes,

Sincerely,

BENJAMIN A. GILMAN,  
*Chairman.*

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE,  
*Washington, DC, September 28, 1998.*

Hon. BEN GILMAN,  
*Chairman, House Committee on International Relations, Washington, DC.*

DEAR CHAIRMAN GILMAN: Thank you for your correspondence on H.R. 4647.

We appreciate the position of your Committee that you will not object to the early consideration of the bill, as introduced, on the suspension calendar.

In light of your Committee's jurisdictional claim, should a conference be agreed to on the bill, I would support the naming of conferees from the Committee on International Relations, and I will certainly consult with you on any Senate amendment to the bill or further action on it or a counterpart from the Senate. Thank you again for your cooperation in this matter, and please feel free to contact me if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

ROBERT F. "BOB" SMITH,  
*Chairman, House Committee on Agriculture.*

Mr. EWING. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EWING) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4647.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. EWING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 4647, the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

#### REMOVAL OF CONFEREES AND APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON S. 2073, JUVENILE CRIME CONTROL AND DELINQUENCY ACT OF 1998

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, and pursuant to clause 6(f), rule X, the chair removes the gentleman from Delaware (Mr. CASTLE) and the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER) as conferees on the Senate bill (S. 2073) to authorize appropriations for the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children, and appoints the gentleman from California (Mr. RIGGS), and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GREENWOOD) to fill the vacancies.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will notify the Senate of the change in conferees.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. SKAGGS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. SKAGGS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extension of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DIAZ-BALART) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. DIAZ-BALART addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Delaware (Mr. CASTLE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. CASTLE addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

#### A TRIBUTE TO SANTA MARIA'S PEACE WEEK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mrs. CAPPS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, as this session of Congress races to a close, we often lose sight of some of the wonder-

ful things happening at home in our communities, and this is especially true when Washington, D.C. is consumed by political battles. That is why I rise today to commend the remarkable city of Santa Maria, California, which I am very proud to represent, in the 22nd district for its second annual Peace Week.

Mr. Speaker, earlier this year I stood on the House floor to congratulate Santa Maria on being named one of 10 All-American Cities. This high honor was justly granted to a city that has distinguished itself by its diversity and the fact that all the residents of Santa Maria work together to find innovative ways to solve their problems.

One glowing example of this community cohesiveness is Peace Week; Peace Week, which begins today. The goal of Peace Week is to stress nonviolence and conflict mediation. Each day brings a focus on a new topic and allows community members of all ages and cultures to discover ways they can make a difference in their own lives and in the lives of their neighbors.

Examples of innovative Peace Week activities include a candlelight march, nonviolence education, and a lecture by a nationally acclaimed advocate, Father Gregory Boyle. Another highlight of Peace Week is a project entitled, "Let's Piece it Together," which features a peace quilt constructed by schoolchildren and senior citizens.

Mr. Speaker, Peace Week is the product of an entire city and its enlightened leadership. I want to pay special tribute to my friend, Sister Janet Corcoran of Marian Medical Center Mission Services, for her remarkable dedication and tireless work on behalf of her community and the precious cause of peace. She is a role model for me and a role model for us all.

#### THE SURVIVAL OF THE SMALL FARMER

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mrs. CLAYTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, why is it that we refuse to help small farmers and ranchers to succeed, yet we refuse to let big business fail? Why is that small farmers and ranchers get little help, while big business gets much help? Small farmers and ranchers are struggling to survive in America, and because they are struggling to survive, quality and affordable food and fiber for all of us is at risk.

They are not struggling to survive for the want of effort. No, Mr. Speaker. Small producers are struggling to survive because of the pressures they are experiencing from a constant barrage of hurricanes, unexpected flooding, unprecedented drought and economic downturns, exacerbated by failing foreign markets.

Much of the problem, too, however, springs from the onerous provisions of the 1996 farm bill that bans family

farmers and ranchers from receiving a loan from the United States Department of Agriculture if a previous loan has been written down. These provisions are causing many farmers and ranchers to go out of business.

Last week, as a part of a conference agreement for the fiscal year 1999 agriculture appropriation bill, we provided some limited relief.

□ 2045

While this response to the provision of the 1996 farm bill is appreciated, it is a feeble response, particularly when compared to the response to the near collapse of the Long-Term Capital Management Hedge Fund.

This hedge fund is unregulated and its activities are not disclosed and virtually unknown, yet its creditors, the New York banks, and the Federal Reserve bailed it out. The bailout was \$3.5 billion, almost as much as the \$4 billion in emergency assistance we provided farmers and ranchers.

Worse, this bailout occurred with little scrutiny, little requirements and conditions imposed against the fund. In fact, the Financial Markets Reassurance Act of 1998 was also included as a part of the conference report. The act prohibits the relevant regulatory agency, the Commodity Futures Trading Commission, from proposing or adopting any new regulations until March of 1999, on certain transactions of the over-the-counter derivative market. The hedge fund bailed out by the banks and the Federal Reserve is heavily invested in that market.

When Congress learned of the problems with this hedge fund, a flurry of activity ensued, including emergency hearings. Yet efforts by the Commodity Futures Trading Commission to regulate this hedge fund was met with intense opposition and resistance.

Notwithstanding the impact that fund can have on America's economy and the stability of financial markets around the world, the response to help the fund was quick and massive.

Mr. Speaker, I must ask, why not the same or even a similar response for the small farmers and ranchers? Persons who have declared bankruptcy are now treated better than our small farmers and ranchers. Those persons can still get a loan, even after they have defaulted on a previous loan.

By law, this Nation routinely forgives debts for foreign countries, and after forgiving those debts, we allow those foreign countries to create more debt. Credit card account defaults are record high, yet new credit cards are issued to those persons who do not want them. We give just about everyone a chance and a second chance, yet we have been slow in doing the same thing for our small farmers and ranchers.

And socially disadvantaged farmers, including minority farmers, are even at a greater risk. Farmers have been most important to this Nation's past and farmers are vital to this Nation's fu-

ture, especially the small family farmers and ranchers.

In 1862, when USDA was created, 90 percent of the population farmed for a living. Today, American producers represent less than 3 percent of the population.

Mr. Speaker, the least we can do is to treat the problem of small farmers and ranchers with the same kind of urgency we gave to the hedge fund last week.

By 1992, there were only 1.1 million small farms left in the United States, a 45% decline from 1959!

North Carolina had only a little over 39,000 farms left in 1992, a 23% decline.

In 1920, there were over 6 million farms in the United States and close to a sixth—926,000 were operated by African-Americans.

In 1992, the landscape was very, very different.

Only 1% of the farms in the United States are operated by African-Americans. One percent—18,816, is a paltry sum when African-Americans comprise 13% of the total American population.

In my home state of North Carolina, there has been a 65% decline in minority farmers, just over the last 15 years, from 6,996 farms in 1978 to 2,498 farms in 1992.

Again, much of the blame for this decline can be attributed to the credit crunch.

The dwindling number of farmers and ranchers feed and help clothe us, and they do so at prices that are unmatched around the world.

#### AMERICA SHOULD NOT RUSH TO WAR

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. DUNCAN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, The New Yorker Magazine has just reported that the White House planned bombing raids on Afghanistan and the Sudan without involving four Members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Even worse, since these were supposedly terrorist targets, FBI Director Louis Freeh was also left out.

Worse than that, The New Yorker said that the White House told Joint Chiefs Chairman Hugh Shelton about the raids, but specifically told him not to brief the other four chiefs of the military and not to consult with the Defense Intelligence Agency.

Perhaps worst of all, Attorney General Janet Reno was ignored when she questioned whether our intelligence was good enough to support these raids, according to this Associated Press report.

I did hear a Paul Harvey newscast a couple of days after these raids saying that our intelligence was bad and that we had bombed, among other things, a medicine factory. I know if another nation bombed a medicine factory here, we would be extremely angry, and rightly so.

I do not understand why our intelligence is continually so weak, when we spend so many billions of dollars more than any other nation each and every year on this.

I am sad to say that I, along with almost every Member of Congress, supported these raids when they first occurred. I, along with almost all of my colleagues, said that we have to take the strongest possible reasonable action against terrorists who are killing innocent people. I did say at the time that I was assuming that our intelligence was good, because I just found it impossible to believe that we would rush to war without being very, very certain that we were targeting the actual terrorists.

I know that there were many people who felt that these bombing raids were done to try to draw attention from the President's troubles. However, I did not believe then that anyone would do anything so horrible, and this article is still no proof that that occurred. But the article does indicate a rush to judgment, an eagerness to go to war that should never happen in this country, a Nation that has already prided itself on its efforts to promote peace and freedom around the world.

We should involve ourselves in war and/or take warlike actions only as a very last resort, and only if there is simply no other reasonable choice. We should conduct bombing raids on others only with extreme reluctance and only when forced to do so.

The article in the New Yorker Magazine raises the most serious questions possible about these raids, and if this article is false or inaccurate, then the administration should immediately refute it. We have involved ourselves in recent years in civil wars in Haiti, Rwanda, Somalia, Bosnia, and now I suppose Kosovo, and we have spent many, many millions of taxpayers dollars in the process.

As I have mentioned before, according to The Washington Post, we had our troops in Haiti picking up garbage and settling domestic disputes. I heard another Member say on this floor that we had our troops in Bosnia, among other things, giving rabies shots to dogs.

The great majority of Americans believe that the Haitians should pick up their own garbage and the Bosnians should give their own rabies shots.

President Kennedy said in 1961 that we have to realize that with just 6 percent of the world's population, we cannot right every wrong and there cannot be an American solution to every world problem. Today we are less than 5 percent of the world's population.

We should be very careful about rushing to war in Kosovo. Jonathan Clarke, a former member of the British Diplomatic Service, now with the Cato Institute, wrote in last Friday's Los Angeles Times, "Some of Milosevic's democratic opponents . . . visited Washington last month to warn that bombing would play into Milosevic's hands and undermine their efforts. They made little progress. The 'CNN factor' is too strong, they were told on Capitol Hill.

"This gives the game away. NATO's plans are directed less at resolving the